REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 11-20, and 22-26 remain for reconsideration. The features of claim 3 have been incorporated into claim 1. Similarly the features of claims 17 and 21 have been incorporated into independent claim 16. Claims 3, 7-10, 17 and 21 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In response to the objection to the title of the invention, the title has been amended to one believed more descriptive of the claimed invention. If the Examiner still believes the new title is not descriptive he is respectfully requested to suggest a suitable title for Applicant's consideration.

The objection to the informal drawings is noted. Formal drawings will be prepared and submitted at such time as the claims are allowed.

All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,644,700 to Dickson et al. (Dickson). This rejection is respectfully traversed based on the following discussion taken with the claim amendments.

Briefly, embodiments of the present invention provide a controller

mode negotiation protocol. Each system management controller in the system is adapted to perform the negotiation protocol. The negotiation protocol may be performed for events such as system initiation or when a single system management controller performs a reset. For example, when a system is powered on, each system management controller in the system may send a controller mode request to other system management controllers according to the negotiation protocol, and may transition to an initial mode based upon a response to the controller mode request.

As shown in Figure 1, system 100 contains four modules 110, 120, 130, and 140 which may be, for example, circuit boards that are inserted into slots of a system chassis. Each of modules 110, 120, 130, and 140 may be a power supply, fan tray, CPU Board, or any other type of component. The controllers in system 100 may each by coupled through an input/output port to a system management bus 150. As explained on page 5, lines 1-10 the bus 150 may be an Intelligent Platform Management Bus (IPMB) which conforms to the Intelligent Platform Management Bus Communications Protocol Specification. A system management controller may communicate with other system components using various types of message formats such as that defined in the Intelligent Platform Management Interface Specification (Intel Corp. et al., v1.5, rev. 1, February. 21, 2001).

In contrast, the controllers of Dickerson, do not teach or suggest the use of an Intelligent Platform Management Bus to communicate status

between the controllers 18 and 19, but rather use an ***interconnect cable 23*** directly connecting each of the controllers (column 5, line 14).

Independent claims 1 and 16 have been amended to include this Intelligent Platform Management Bus Feature. For example, claim 1 recites: "includes an input/output port to send messages that comply with the Intelligent Platform Management Interface specification to negotiate with other system management controllers" (emphasis added).

Claim 16 recites "wherein the mode requests and responses are sent as messages that comply with the Intelligent Platform Management Interface" (emphasis added).

With regard to claims 11-15, independent claim 11 recites "...cause the first system management controller to: transition from a reset to a request state.." (emphasis added).

Nothing in Dickson teaches or suggests transitioning from a reset state to a request state.

MPEP § 2131 mandates that "TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT IN THE CLAIM". Furthermore, the MPEP, citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 9 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987), states "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the... claim" (emphasis added).

Dickson does not teach using an Intelligent Platform Management Bus to communicate between the modules. In contrast, it teaches using a separate

interconnect cable which would involve separate cabling between each of the control modules. Further Dickson does not teach or suggest the controllers transitioning from a reset state to a request state as recited in the claims.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejections to the claims are improper under Section 102 as Dickson cannot anticipate the rejected claims since they do not "teach the identical invention". Nor, can Dickson make a case of *prima facie* obviousness under Section 103 since all of the claimed features are not shown or reasonably suggested. Based on the above discussion with reference to the MPEP guidelines, it is respectfully requested that the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

This being the only rejection to the claims it is respectfully requested that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing, it requested that the application be reconsidered, that claims 1-2, 4-6, 11-20, and 22-26 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to Intel's Deposit Account number 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin A. Reif

Kevin A. Reif
Reg. No. 36,381

INTEL
LF1-102
4050 Lafayette Center Drive
Chantilly, Virginia 20151
(703) 633-6834